

DU 627

· 4

· B7

R. F. Broussard 3 000
22/ DUL687 H. F. R
98 .4
.167

H A W A I I .

S P E E C H

OF

HON. R. F. BROUSSARD,

OF LOUISIANA,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

25.10
5353

JUNE 14, 1898.

WASHINGTON.

1898.

M. V. P.



P
Mr. W. A. Smith

72943



Jul 27
4
B7

S P E E C H
OF
H O N . R . F . B R O U S S A R D .

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. Res. 253) to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States—

Mr. BROUSSARD said:

Mr. SPEAKER: In the discussion of the project advanced by the pending resolution it is evident that we are not occupied with the benefits that are to accrue to the people of Hawaii, but our concern is how our people are to be affected. I take this to be the sole question at issue with us. I shall make no attempt to convince those who in this or any other matter of public import assume the position that the policy of our Government should seek to benefit any people save our own. Those who argue that we should annex Hawaii because it will result beneficially to the people of the islands will not be heard patiently by me, nor shall I stoop to argue the matter with them. The advantage or disadvantage to them is a question of supreme indifference to me. Let them look to their own interests.

The greatest good to the greatest number of the American people should be the inexorable rule of every American, in or out of Congress, in the solution of all public problems.

I therefore lay down the proposition as self-evident that it is not only our right but our highest duty to consider no other but our own interests in discussing this project.

Accepting this as the true criterion by which we are to be guided in considering this resolution, it necessarily follows that with those who advocate annexation rests the burden of proving that we shall be benefited by annexation.

But before entering into a discussion of the advantages or disadvantages to accrue to us through annexation, I desire to emphasize the fact that, in my opinion, the House is without power to pass upon this question in the shape presented.

Generally speaking, a nation may acquire territory by conquest, by purchase, or by discovery. The framers of our Constitution laid down the rule of action, however, that we may, apart from the modus operandi just mentioned, acquire territory by treaty. Under this provision Jefferson negotiated the purchase of Louisiana and the Northwest from France in 1803. Under President Monroe, in 1819, in the same way we acquired Florida from Spain, and during the Presidency of Mr. Johnson, in 1870, Alaska was ceded to us by Russia. Upper California, including what is now California, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Arizona, we acquired in 1848, under Mr. Polk's Administration, as a result of our war with Mexico. Our title to this latter territory is by force of conquest.

We purchased Alaska from Russia in 1867. The title was conveyed by treaty. The only other territory acquired by us was Texas, in 1845, under President Tyler's Administration. Texas, an independent republic, was admitted into the Union as a new State. It was never annexed in the true sense of the word, nor can it be quoted as a precedent for this "scheme," for it is not here sought to admit Hawaii into the Union as a new State. Nowhere in the Constitution do I find authority vested in this House

to acquire territory, except to admit new States into the Union, and then this authority is exercised conjunctively with the Senate.

The Senate alone is vested with power to ratify or reject treaties having for their purpose acquisition of territory. The territory of Upper California, then, was obtained by conquest; Louisiana, Florida, and Alaska were acquired under the treaty-making power, and Texas was admitted into the Union under the express power given Congress to admit new States. But I shall not further deal with this phase of the question. Abler men have long since settled it in the debate that led to the admission of Texas into the Union.

But lest, in their greed to acquire foreign territory, the advocates of annexation should, by brute force, brush aside this constitutional plea, as they evidently propose to do, I shall return to a discussion of the merits of the controversy.

I can conceive of but three ways that we can be benefited by the acquisition of any territory—that is, from a commercial standpoint, or from a military standpoint, or from a political standpoint.

Now, in annexing Hawaii, shall we be benefited in a commercial way? Let us see.

Since 1875 our Government has been in commercial treaty with Hawaii. Our trade relations with her under the treaty make absolutely certain the benefits or disadvantages which must follow annexation. Under the treaty the products of the islands are placed on our markets free of duty, while in return the duties of many of the manufactured articles of the United States are remitted us. Our present trade relations with Hawaii, therefore, are exactly what they will be after annexation, if we commit the blunder of annexing. Now, have we lost or gained by this exchange of commodities under the treaty?

I here attach a comparative statement of our export and import trade with Hawaii:

TRADE OF THE UNITED STATES WITH HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

Total exports and imports of merchandise.

Year ending June 30—	Exports.			Imports.			Excess of im- ports.
	Domes- tic.	For- eign.	Total.	Free.	Duti- able.	Total.	
1875.....	\$621,974	\$40,190	\$662,164	\$168,771	\$1,058,420	\$1,227,191	\$565,027
1876.....	724,267	54,990	779,257	192,071	1,184,610	1,376,681	597,424
1877.....	1,109,429	163,520	1,272,949	2,385,366	164,969	2,550,335	1,277,386
1878.....	1,683,446	52,653	1,736,099	2,641,628	37,202	2,678,830	942,731
1879.....	2,288,178	86,740	2,374,918	3,243,988	13,950	3,257,938	883,020
1880.....	1,985,506	100,664	2,086,170	4,565,918	40,526	4,606,444	2,520,274
1881.....	2,694,583	83,489	2,778,072	5,517,737	15,263	5,533,000	2,754,928
1882.....	3,272,172	78,603	3,350,775	7,621,690	24,604	7,646,294	4,295,519
1883.....	3,683,460	92,805	3,776,265	8,195,937	42,524	8,238,461	4,462,396
1884.....	3,446,024	77,329	3,523,353	7,900,060	25,965	7,925,965	4,402,612
1885.....	2,709,573	78,349	2,787,922	8,817,067	40,430	8,857,497	6,069,575
1886.....	3,115,899	76,799	3,192,698	9,741,924	63,783	9,805,707	6,613,009
1887.....	3,520,593	101,436	3,622,029	9,892,889	29,186	9,922,075	6,300,046
1888.....	3,025,898	59,305	3,085,203	11,050,038	10,341	11,060,379	7,975,176
1889.....	3,336,040	39,621	3,375,661	12,832,910	14,830	12,817,740	9,472,079
1890.....	4,606,900	104,517	4,711,417	12,309,758	4,150	12,313,908	7,602,491
1891.....	4,935,911	171,301	5,107,212	13,865,648	29,949	13,895,597	8,788,385
1892.....	3,662,018	119,610	3,781,628	8,062,076	13,806	8,075,882	4,294,254
1893.....	2,717,338	110,325	2,827,663	9,087,856	58,911	9,146,767	6,319,104
1894.....	3,217,713	88,474	3,306,187	9,969,981	95,336	10,065,317	6,759,130
1895.....	3,648,472	74,585	3,723,057	7,870,304	18,657	7,888,961	4,165,904
1896.....	3,928,187	57,520	3,985,707	11,743,343	14,361	11,757,704	7,771,997
1897.....	4,622,581	67,494	4,690,075	13,663,012	24,787	13,687,799	8,997,724

A mere glance at these figures shows that for every dollar's worth of merchandise that we have been permitted to place upon the Hawaiian market without paying duty to the Hawaiian Government the people of the islands have been allowed to use our markets free of duty for from two to three dollars' worth of their goods.

In other words, for every dollar's worth of advantage we have secured from them under the treaty we have paid them from two to three dollars; and in doing this we have placed American toilers, in field and factory, in direct competition with the cheap contract labor of Hawaii.

Strange to say, this "scheme" finds its greatest supporters on the other side of this Chamber, where men most prate of the protection of American labor. It appears, too, from these statistics that a large percentage of the goods exported by us to Hawaii is of foreign manufacture, so that American laborers are greater sufferers from the treaty than at first is apparent.

To adopt this resolution would be to perpetuate these conditions and to continue the competition between American and Asiatic labor, not in the markets of the world, but to invite the competition at home on an equal footing with us.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent the greatest sugar-producing district in the United States. Rice within the last few years has become a staple product in my district.

These two articles are practically the only products raised for exportation in the Sandwich Islands. Both commodities are admitted into this country under the present treaty free of duty.

Annexation would forever keep our markets free for the admission of both of these articles. Representing, as I do, a district whose main dependence is in these two products, I take it that I have the right to voice the opinion and to advocate the rights of my people in opposition to this "scheme."

Laborers, mechanics, and chemists in the sugar fields and refineries of Louisiana receive good wages to-day. On the rice farms and in the rice mills of southwest Louisiana men find employment readily and at remunerative figures. There no strikes are heard, menacing the security of the community. No injunctions are resorted to to coerce one man to starve that his more fortunate neighbor might enrich himself. There the shrill and discordant voice of anarchy is never heard. There there is contentment and happiness and plenty. Men enjoy more independence and liberty there than anywhere on earth. Your proposition is to strike a deathly blow at all these blessings.

In the great West men are learning to appreciate the possibilities of sugar-beet culture. Up to recently it seemed to be the one ambition of the Secretary of Agriculture to advance and foster the sugar-beet industry in the section of the country from which he hails. We in Louisiana felt that the beet sugar would at no distant time supplant cane sugar, because it can be produced cheaper, but we welcomed our neighbors in this field of operation. Their competition was to be American competition amongst American citizens, white man competing against white man. We were glad to meet them, and we would have rejoiced at their success; but what do you propose to do with this budding hope of the West? Suffocate it, stifle it, strangle it, together with its older brother of the South; and for what and for whom? For a trade in which the American people lose three times as much as they gain. For a race of negroes, of Chinese, half-breeds, and lepers.

What have these done that they should be paid to receive better treatment at our father's house than we, the children, should have?

Pause and consider before you take such a course. The step into the abyss is easily taken; once taken it can never be retraced. For all time to come, should you annex Hawaii, must my people surrender to these people their heritage and the West her hopes of adding to her already great achievements in agriculture? And the surrender will be all the more mortifying when in return we shall receive a "mess of pottage."

But, says the Secretary of Agriculture and the advocates of annexation here, you overestimate the possibilities of sugar and rice in the Hawaiian Islands. Let us see if this is so.

In Hawaii, the Philippines, and the West Indies sugar cane is indigenous to the soil. Here it is not. Sugar can there be raised, according to governmental statistics, at a cost of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. Here it costs nearly 4 cents. To the sugar trust, which controls the entire imported output, transportation is cheap.

How long then, I ask, can our people maintain this unequal and unjust competition? You great protectors of American labor and American industries, answer me this, if you dare.

The following is an official statement:

TRADE OF THE UNITED STATES WITH HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

Total imports of sugar and molasses, and the estimated amounts of duty remitted.

Year ending June 30—	Molasses.	Sugar, Dutch standard in color.										Total value of sugar and mo- lasses.	Estimated duties remitted. a
		Above No. 7 and not above No. 10.		Above No. 10 and not above No. 13.		Above No. 13 and not above No. 16.		Above No. 16 and not above No. 20.		Total.			
		Galls.	Dolls.	Pounds.	Dollars.	Pounds.	Dollars.	Pounds.	Dollars.	Pounds.	Dollars.		
1877	138,072	23,506.8	980,804	220,155	11,291,315	714,490	10,183,556	737,525.5	186,406	426,303	30,642,081	2,108,473	986,475.30
1878	87,534	14,449.2	487,990	161,822	10,805,283	757,734	12,227,750	963,550.4	4,897,345	391,224	30,308,338	2,274,450	989,602.02
1879	98,112	14,630.8	517,146	161,822	10,865,686	1,099,194	15,670,564	1,118,118.1	1,232,673	92,061	41,693,069	2,811,193	1,266,554.77
1880	111,950	19,035.7	793,349	450,030	28,416,506	1,892,737	23,868,886	1,680,061.1	1,477,468	103,659	61,556,324	4,153,822	1,881,564.77
1881	198,987	35,037.5	373,005	286,707	53,228,779	1,774,932	43,049,613	2,865,862.2	78,909,207	4,927,021	4,962,058	2,437,777.57	
1882	152,770	25,256.3	952,906	182,873	53,228,779	3,416,315	44,973,293	3,026,298.8	4,027,380	232,535	106,181,858	6,918,084	3,314,938.90
1883	238,773	37,435.5	1,173,726	243,562	53,228,779	3,416,315	50,821,114	3,865,184.2	2,234,111	157,606	114,132,680	7,340,633	3,554,913.96
1884	163,347	22,964.1	—	—	178,249,593	4,287,730	44,983,790	2,702,732.1	1,905,297	117,770	123,148,680	7,108,292	2,959,913.39
1885	71,649	7,034.1	—	—	116,363,506	6,490,517	52,193,920	2,694,762.1	1,083,257	52,865	169,632,783	8,196,826	4,435,091.90
1886	61,127	7,780.1	—	—	135,688,543	6,275,442	57,331,700	2,856,511	762,932	34,873	191,735,175	9,166,826	4,435,091.90
1887	118,574	14,712.1	—	—	157,390,539	6,535,021	60,740,925	2,713,232	159,571	7,088	218,540,513	10,280,048	5,016,380.71
1888	32,562	6,411.1	—	—	203,137,355	9,119,899	26,402,978	1,140,149	—	—	228,540,513	10,280,048	5,016,380.71
1889	48,143	6,148.1	—	—	235,445,211	11,641,490	7,879,472	437,028	—	—	243,324,683	12,078,518	5,210,049.55
1890	81,443	8,314.1	—	—	217,674,588	11,139,862	6,782,673	409,966	—	—	224,437,011	11,549,828	4,804,477.19
1891	76,019	8,530.1	—	—	169,157,107	7,682,749	138,097,909	5,469,975	—	—	307,255,016	13,152,562	4,804,477.19
1892	51,139	5,911.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	202,612,405	7,442,047	(b)
1893	67,324	7,561.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	288,517,929	8,455,622	(b)
1894	7,370	653.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	324,726,584	9,379,317	(b)
1895	51,879	3,500.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	274,219,828	7,396,215	(b)
1896	33,705	1,902.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	352,175,209	11,336,698	4,535,382.50
1897	26,866	1,523.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	705,431,217	116,163,165	5,235,751.60

^aThe collector of customs at San Francisco, under date of February 26, 1886, forwards a statement of his appraiser that the isopic test of the Hawaiian sugar brought into that port during the fiscal years 1884 and 1885 would average a little above 93°. The estimated duty remitted has, therefore, since 1883, been computed, on sugar not above No. 13, at 2.12 cents per pound, which is the equivalent of the polariscopic test above indicated.

^bDuty remitted calculated only to April 1, 1891, when sugar imported from all countries was made free.

Our loss in governmental revenues from this treaty from sugar alone is nearly \$60,000,000, while from rice importations five millions more were lost to us. Annexation will perpetuate this condition of affairs, and with the continued increase of the production of sugar on the four islands comprising the coveted territory we must expect to surrender to these people every year from five to eight million dollars of our revenues, for what? For the pleasure of paying the national debt of the people of the islands, of protecting them from foreign invasion, building up their commerce, and fortifying their coast.

Strange as it may seem, the strongest supporters of this "scheme" are the men who wrote in their party platform in 1896 these words:

Resolved, We condemn the present (Democratic) Administration for not keeping faith with the sugar producers of this country. The Republican party favors such protection as will lead to the production on American soil of all the sugar which the American people use, and for which they pay other countries more than \$100,000,000 annually.

In the face of this solemn declaration, this harrowing condemnation of the Democratic party, we find the President, elected on that platform, advocating this "scheme." We find his Secretary of Agriculture in one breath urging the West to engage in sugar raising and in the other advocating the annexation of Hawaii, with the full knowledge that this must be the ultimate destruction of that industry. We find the Republican majority of the House committee urging to a man the annexation of these islands. And, finally, we see practically a solid Republican vote back of the resolution.

Why give us a tariff on sugar if you propose to admit free of duty more sugar than the American people consume? Did you give it to us that the differential in favor of the sugar trust might not appear isolated? Did you offer us assistance that our destruction might be more keenly felt? Is it another exemplification of the Greeks bearing gifts? The ancient proverb said that the gods made blind those whom they would destroy, but you would seem to pet and pamper your victims.

But whenever you confront these modern sleight-of-hand platform manipulators with this declaration, they reply that the Hawaiian Islands produce too little sugar and rice to affect the American price of either. This same argument was advanced when the treaty was being discussed in 1875, yet this treaty stimulated the sugar production in the islands fully forty-five fold since 1877. The islands then produced 10,183,556 pounds of sugar, while last year the production was 451,196,980 pounds.

But let us examine this statement more closely. We are great sugar eaters. We consume, next to the English, more sugar than any other people on earth. Our consumption is 64½ pounds of sugar per capita per annum. In 1897 we consumed 2,096,263 tons, or a little over 4,000,000,000 pounds. Louisiana produced of this 631,699,561 pounds; other American States, 12,475,762 pounds; total American production, 644,175,323 pounds. We imported from Hawaii, free of duty, 431,196,980 pounds, making a total of 1,075,372,303 pounds. This is over 25 per cent of our entire consumption.

If we annexed Hawaii and her sister islands and stopped there, perhaps my complaint would be ill-founded. But listen to the "tale of woe" of the annexationists. First, we simply wanted the Sandwich Islands because they were necessary to us in our Asiatic trade. In the other Chamber the discussions on this prop-

osition were long and extended. We must have the islands, said they, because Pearl Harbor, in the Island of Oahu, is necessary for our defense. In case of war our western coast would be at the mercy of our enemies. Lo and behold, the war did come, and the false prophets saw the conditions of their prophecy reversed. Not our coast was in danger, but the enemy's possessions, 5,000 miles farther east. And, with these conditions confronting them, we find them playing on the other string. We must have the islands, say they now, so as to maintain our possessions in the East.

It is clear to my mind that the possession of Hawaii is but the entering wedge to a colonial policy by this Government.

The "scheme" is not only to possess ourselves of Hawaii, but maintain sovereignty over the Philippines and Puerto Rico, once these are captured, as captured they must be in this war. And then, pursuing the policy further, to subsequently declare we are unable to maintain a "stable government" in Cuba, and take her, too.

That this is the policy of the present Administration is apparent even to the blind.

Now, what will all this mean to the sugar and rice industries of this country?

Following is our sugar importations from the islands:

Islands.	Year.	Pounds.
Philippines	{ 1897	72,463,577
	{ 1888	274,809,392
Puerto Rico	{ 1897	86,607,317
	{ 1888	115,653,909
Cuba	{ 1897	576,260,997
	{ 1894	2,127,497,454

I have arranged these figures in this shape for this reason: In the last few years all of these islands have been in revolution. Particularly is this true of Cuba. The result has been that, in Cuba at least, little attention has been paid to agriculture. We know that almost all the sugar factories have been burned either by the insurgents or the Spanish army. Consequently there has been a great falling off in our importation of Cuban sugar. Spain receiving little or no sugar from Cuba, necessarily her demands on Puerto Rico and the Philippines became greater, and hence these islands could not send us as much sugar as formerly.

Besides, it is not a question of the sugar we may have imported from these islands, but rather a question of their productive capacity. These figures clearly indicate that, the American market being made free for these sugars, and the population shut off from their present trade with Spain, much more sugar would come into this country from these islands than we can consume. Yet it is admitted that these islands are not now, nor have they ever been, cultivated to their full sugar capacity. Figures are not at my command showing the producing capacity in sugar and rice of these islands, still sufficient data are here given to show a greater production of sugar than we can possibly need, and the result is that large portions of these islands will be turned into rice fields, and eventually the American rice producer must follow the American sugar producer.

This must be the result of the Republican policy sought to be

fastened upon the American people by the pending resolution. As well take off your tariffs on these articles. They can possibly serve no further useful purpose.

Sirs, there is no more reason why Hawaii should be annexed than that the Philippines and Puerto Rico, once captured, should be held; and no more reason to hold these than to grab Cuba—a war not for conquest notwithstanding. Hawaii is but the commencement; the others will follow, and thus will the American sugar and rice producers go to the wall, destroyed in the house of their supposed friends.

It is true that the same platform spoke of reciprocity as one of its cardinal principles. It is also true that in his campaign Mr. McKinley took occasion to say in one of his addresses delivered at Canton to an audience of drummers brought there to hear him that the reciprocity mentioned in the platform had especial reference to the countries to the south of us; and to quote the sense of his remarks: The Republican party desires to shape the policy of this Government so that American flour would find a free market in Havana, while the American people would enjoy the blessings of cheap sugar.

We from the sugar district of the United States knew that such a policy, if pursued, would be ruinous to American sugar, yet some of us felt certain that in time this policy would be changed; and, feeling so, a great many intelligent, honest, progressive men in my district, interested in sugar production, voted for Mr. McKinley for President. Had he or his party at that time taken the position now assumed, and advocated annexation of these islands, I venture the opinion that not 10 per cent of the votes cast there in the last national election would have been Republican.

In place of your resolution one should be pending abrogating the existing Hawaiian treaty. It is a fraud upon the American sugar producer, an imposition upon the American consumer, an unjust discrimination against foreign friendly sugar nations, and a robbery of our National Treasury. In vain do we look for any beneficiary of this treaty, save the sugar planters on the islands and the American sugar trust. It will be remembered that this treaty only exempts raw sugars. Consequently the sugar producer here must compete with the Hawaiian sugar producer, while the refined sugar pays duty, and the sugar trust secures the profit.

The American sugar trust, the meanest, the most grasping, the most debauching and disgraceful of all the trusts, has reaped a rich harvest from this treaty. It has robbed the American people through it. It has unjustly collected and unfairly appropriated revenues which, without the treaty, would have belonged to the Government. Without this treaty possibly it could not have cleared the three hundred millions it boasts to have accumulated in the last ten years upon its nominal capital of seventy-five millions; it perhaps could not pay two hundred thousand per year to its president and its treasurer. At least those things which it has done to the injury of the American people would have been less shocking without this treaty; and now you propose to perpetuate all these conditions.

But it is said that the sugar trust is opposed to annexation. Sometimes I am tempted to inquire if those who make the assertion believe it. The truth is, under this treaty the unholy alliance of the sugar trust and the Spreckels interests have now the

control of the sugar production on the islands. They refine the whole of it. To terminate the treaty under the twelve months' notice provided for in section 5 of the treaty would ruin the further prospects of profits of the trust from the islands. This may occur at any time. It has been attempted in Congress several times. It should have occurred long ago.

Having the control of the plantations, the trust is naturally desirous of planting its advantages on a firmer foundation. Annexation would, in honor, force this great Government to maintain its sovereignty over the islands, though it bankrupt the nation, lost us the best blood of the land, and wrecked the American Navy to do it. Holding the plantations in its grasp, and raw sugar raised on them being admitted here free, the result to the trust can not be in doubt. This Hawaiian sugar speculation would not only be "a thing of beauty, but a joy forever" to the sugar trust should your resolution become law. It will not do to argue that the sugar trust is opposed to your resolution. Such argument will not deceive anyone at all familiar with the question.

Nor will it do for honorable gentlemen to argue as your committee has done in its report. The bugbear that we must annex Hawaii because if we fail some other nation will be begging the question entirely. It does not even rise to the dignity of an argument. The American Government opposing, no nation will dare attempt to take possession of the islands.

To annex is to assume sovereignty. Sovereignty carries with it responsibility. And, in fact, one of the stock arguments of the annexationists is that we should take the islands because the present Government can not maintain itself. Yet the Dole Government is essentially a white-man government. If this be true, then do these gentlemen invite us to assert control over a people—to assume the responsibility of a government—upon the admission? Nay! for the very reason that the white inhabitants of the islands can not maintain their superiority over its mongrel population.

I yearn for no such responsibility. But I am not prepared to admit that the Dole Government can not maintain itself in power.

Unhampered by adverse legislation, such as the fourteenth amendment, I assert that the history of the world demonstrates that the Caucasian race, wherever it has ventured, has dominated all other races. This is true of the white man everywhere and at all times.

The history of the reconstruction of the South bears testimony to the fact that the white man will rule even though hampered by enimical legislation.

So long as England and France maintain their positions as regards the islands, so long as we stand firm to the Monroe doctrine, well may the people of the islands rest assured that no flag will wave over them except their own. Well may we laugh at those who tremble lest Japan or Germany or any other nation shall take possession of them against our wishes. And should France free herself from her agreement with England on this subject, then the more reason for a treaty with England on our part. Under those circumstances, to admit that Hawaii is in danger in her sovereignty is to admit that the two great English-speaking peoples are unable to maintain their own sovereignty.

But what if some European or Asiatic nation does take possession of them? What is the danger to us? Right off our coasts Great

L. M. C.

Britain owns the Bermudas and Vancouver. All of these years we have given ourselves no great concern about this, nor did we during the war of the Revolution, nor during the war of 1812. France owns Guadeloupe, Martinique, and St. Bartholemew, yet in this moment of war we are not thrown into tremors on this account, even though France does not seem overzealous on our behalf. Jamaica belongs to England; Germany owns Curacao; Denmark owns St. John, St. Croix, and St. Thomas, yet do we care? We have never lost sleep of nights because of these facts. Spain owns the richest islands of the group to the south of us; yet what good have these been to her during this war?

Before formal declaration of war we had cut her off from Cuba, her best island. Before a single American life had been sacrificed we held Puerto Rico in a similar condition. Even her far-off possessions—the Philippines—fell an easy prey to our valor and intrepidity, and the advantage Spain once held over us there has been and is being utilized to our advantage. So that Spain, with all of her rich possessions around us, can not find a single coaling station for her fleet so as to properly prepare to give us battle.

Once annexed, we can not always expect to hold Hawaii as a Territory. Territorial possession with us heretofore has only been the probationary stage to Statehood. The time will come when Hawaii will aspire to plant another star on our flag. Political exigencies will see to it that the boon is granted. What a parody on free government will her's be!

The population of the islands, according to the latest estimate, is as follows:

Hawaiians (Kanakas and half-breeds)	39,504
Japanese	25,407
Chinese	21,616
Portuguese	15,291
Americans	3,080
British	2,250
Germans	1,432

What a magnificent free government these people would form and maintain! What a rotten borough to send representatives to our Congress! What votes to cast in the electoral college!

From all these things I pray God the American people may be spared.

The negro question has been a very serious question with the South. It has inflicted sufferings and humiliations upon my people.

The dark night of negro domination lives in the past, thank God! I want no more of it. Let us not stir up its putrid flesh nor shake its decayed bones in the charnel house of oblivion.

Let us rather hope that some of the Southern States have solved the vexing problem, and that all the others will soon follow the magnificent example set them by South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana. In the name of the white men of Hawaii, let them control their Government without the interference of the fourteenth amendment; in the name of the white men of America, let us not enlarge the scope of this race question.

The West suffered so long from Chinese labor that a great uprising occurred long ago among her people. The Government was appealed to, and the gates of liberty were shut to the Mongolian.

Let us not add, in bulk, to the population of this great country the wretched Mongolian who now tills the sugar plantations of

the islands. Let them not come again to disturb the tranquillity of our Western country. We do not want them. The American people do not care for them. They themselves are ignorant of our form of government and do not wish to be of us. Those who deny this should be willing to submit the question to the popular vote of the people of the islands, as was done with the people of Texas, as was done with the people of Santo Domingo, when President Grant urged its annexation to the United States.

But a greater reason than all of these conquers my judgment and forces my conscience to oppose this scheme. All men may not agree with the Republican platform that it is important that all sugar consumed by the American people should be produced on American soil; some men may be indifferent to the issue; but in this all men agree who live under the American flag, that this glorious Government must be perpetuated; unscathed and unscarred, it must walk through the coming centuries, accumulating strength and vigor at each step. It is accomplishing a God-conceived mission on earth. It is solving the great problem of free government and human happiness. The man who would change its course by so much as a fraction of a line, would nullify for a moment the advances being made for liberty, science, and civilization, is unworthy of his country.

Yet if we have accomplished so much it is because of the homogeneity of our people and of the impactness of our possessions. Our strength has consisted heretofore in the fact that we are essentially a peaceful people. No nation has cared to war with us because it had nothing to gain. We have been able to follow Washington's advice to keep from "foreign entangling alliances" because we had no possessions foreign from our mainland to protect. We have kept out of foreign complications growing out of European and Asiatic wars because none of our possessions were exposed and none could become involved. We have kept our Army on the basis of a home guard because we feared no invasion.

Why change all of these advantages? Why appeal to the passions? Why enter the field of foreign court intrigues? Heretofore we have been able to devote our energies to the sciences and arts and literature, while other nations employed much of their human wealth preparing for war, offensive and defensive. We have had all of our forces producing wealth, while other nations have elected half of their forces to remain idle, compelling the other half to toil to maintain this state of idleness. Is not departure from this worse than folly on our part? Nay, is it not treason itself to seek to alter these glorious conditions? The truth and justness and fairness of my position seem so apparent that, like the man who would prove an axiom, I find myself laboring. Did I deem it necessary to furnish authority to maintain this position, I could quote from Tyler and Daniel Webster and Taylor and Blaine and Sherman and Bayard and others of equal prominence in the past politics of this country.

To annex Hawaii will require of us the maintenance of a large navy in the Pacific Ocean; to hold Puerto Rico or any of the West Indies will require another large navy in the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea, and to hold the Philippines another navy will have to be maintained off the coast of Asia and in the Chinese Sea.

And why, I ask, should we squander the money to do this, when for our pains we shall only be borrowing trouble and invite war?

If in the course of human events we are compelled by necessity to have Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or the Philippines, another Dewey will arise from among this great people, and the feat will soon be accomplished, and glory, godlike and fair, will be our harvest.

Who of you doubts this?

The declaration of Jefferson that we should acquire no territory requiring a navy to protect is as good policy to-day as it was when he first uttered it. It has been in keeping with this policy that heretofore, with the exception of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands, we have abstained from acquiring territory not contiguous to our original thirteen colonies, though on two former occasions territory of that character was offered us as a gift. Even now, after over a quarter of a century of our possession of Alaska, the most ardent annexationist is not prepared to state that this possession has brought us either glory or profit, though it has been the source of complication between our Government and England; while our possession of the Aleutian Islands has been regarded so indifferently by us that we make no pretense of having a government there.

The day that we depart from the wise policy that I have been trying to picture disaster must overtake us. Foreign complications must arise; we must maintain an immense navy and standing army; we must divert from the pursuits of peaceful occupation and the production of wealth a vast number of our citizens and throw the burden of supporting them and the Government upon the balance of the people.

At the inception of our present war with Spain we were loud in our declaration that humanitarian reasons alone prompted us to action. The resolution declaring for armed intervention on our part in the war between Spain and Cuba specifically declared or strongly intimated that this war was not for conquest.

Yet this Administration seems now entirely devoted to the conquest and acquisition of territory. The people of Cuba must be relieved, we said. Yet not a blow has so far been struck to relieve the reconcentrados, while 9,000 miles from these suffering people our fleet has found its way and territory is in the course of changing hands. During this time a peaceful blockade of Cuba is being maintained. To all intents and purposes we are giving assistance to the Spaniard in his policy to starve out his Cuban subjects. Alas, poor humanity; another great crime is being committed in thy name!

Listen! "Colonial territory!" "Imperial policy!" What enticing phrases! How dazzling to the eye! How euphonious to the ear!

But, my countrymen, do not forget that these never come unattended. They have never become a people's possession that tranquility and peace and harmony and happiness have not departed. History does not record the people whose highest aspiration this was that it did not encompass their destruction.

This issue was never presented to the American people. Let not gentlemen here listen to the croaking of partisan newspapers and accept it as the voice of the people. It is not the people's voice you hear; it is the voice of the interested party, who arrogates to himself the voice of the nation. They are but visions and dreams of imperial grandeur, that are being conjured up by these special advocates.

The American people are too sensible, too full of common sense,

to be lured from their peaceful avocations, to seek to embark in a field of conquest and strife and intrigue and war. You who doubt this dare not consult them.

These are evils that I fear. They will undermine the Republic. I can not free my mind from these conclusions. They force themselves upon me. I am unwilling to attempt the experiment.

Continuing the wise policy that to this hour we have pursued, I see everything ahead bright and glorious, and can predict of this Republic what Lord Macaulay said of the Catholic Church:

She may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveler from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's.

[Applause.]

3452

○

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 944 324 0

DU 627

· 4

· B7

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 944 324 0

Hollinger Corp.
pH 8.5